

Remarks/Arguments:

Claims 1-20 were pending. Claims 1-20 stand rejected. Applicants herein amend claim 1 to include the limitations of claim 5 and cancel claim 5. In addition, applicants herein amend claims 6-11 to depend from claim 1 rather than now canceled claim 5 and add new claims 21-23. Support for the added claims is found throughout the specification and, in particular, at paragraphs 21 and 45 of the application as originally filed. No new matter is added by the claim amendments and, accordingly, entry and approval of same is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, and 4-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,204,496 to Boulay et al. (herein Boulay). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below and reconsideration is requested.

Applicants' invention, as recited by claim 1 (as amended) includes a feature that is neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

a shield coupled to said electronic assembly and positioned to cover said second access opening defined by said enclosure, wherein said shield includes a cover portion and a plurality of extensions adjacent said cover portion, said extensions together at least partially defining a channel extending along at least a portion of said cover portion, said channel having substantially parallel boundaries, said channel being configured to received a portion of the enclosure and to slidably engage the enclosure such that, when engaged, said cover portion inhibits electromagnetic interference emissions from the enclosure.

This means that a shield includes a cover and a plurality of extensions adjacent the cover. The plurality of extensions define a channel that slidably engages an enclosure and the cover inhibits electromagnetic (EMI) emissions from the enclosure when the channel engages the enclosure. Thus, the shield slidably engages the enclosure to inhibit EMI emissions from the enclosure. Embodiments of this feature are found throughout the specification of the originally filed application and, specifically, at paragraph 44 and in FIGs. 3A and 4.

Boulay does not disclose, teach, or suggest a shield that slidably engages an enclosure to inhibit EMI emissions from the enclosure. Boulay recites:

FIG. 6 shows one of the gaskets 22 held in position to be mounted at a slot 20. As indicated, the ends 26 are held in a bowed condition for snap-in mounting of the gasket 22. In this bowed condition the U-shaped side channel members 24 of the gasket 22 are placed closer together for ease of mounting and the channel entrances 34 are disposed for easier mounting. FIG. 7 shows the gasket 22 mounted at the slot 20 with a slot cover 54 positioned to cover the slot 20.

See Boulay at column 4, lines 4-10. Thus, Boulay teaches a gasket that snaps into engagement with an enclosure rather than slidably engaging the enclosure as set forth in claim 1. Further, the gasket in Boulay is designed to fit into a rectangular slot. See Boulay at paragraph spanning columns 2 and 3 and FIG. 1. As the slot in Boulay does not extend to the edge of the enclosure, the gasket in Boulay cannot slide into engagement with the enclosure but must be bowed for snap-in mounting within the slot. Therefore, Boulay does not disclose, teach, or suggest a shield that slidably engages an enclosure to inhibit EMI emissions from the enclosure. Further, none of the cited art disclose, teach, or suggest this feature.

It is because applicants' include the feature of a shield including a cover and extensions adjacent the cover that define a channel which slidably engages an enclosure that the following advantages are achieved. By slidably engaging the enclosure, the cover can quickly and easily be added to and removed from electronic assemblies. Thus, EMI emissions from electronic assemblies can be easily inhibited while maintaining ease of scalability. In addition, slidable engagement permits rigid covers rather than requiring flexible covers that permit the covers to snap into openings of an enclosure as in Boulay. See specification of the originally filed application at paragraph 44 and 45. A rigid cover is able to securely support other objects such as a trim piece, which may cause a flexible gasket such as used in Boulay to deform and, thus, diminish its effectiveness at reducing EMI emissions. Further, rigid covers may be better suited for larger openings than flexible gaskets such as used in Boulay.

Accordingly, for the reasons set forth above, applicants contend that claim 1 (as amended) is allowable over the cited art and respectfully request that the rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 12 and 19, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1 as amended. Specifically, claim 12 is directed to a shield having a cover portion and a plurality of extensions adjacent the cover portion that define a channel that slidably engages an enclosure to inhibits EMI emissions from the enclosure and claim 19 is directed to a method of inhibiting EMI emissions from an enclosure that includes the step of "sliding the extensions [of a shield] into engagement . . . with the enclosure . . . , thereby inhibiting EMI emissions from the enclosure." (Emphasis added.) This is unlike Boulay, which, as described above, discloses a gasket that snaps into a slot rather than being slid as called for in claims 12 and 19. Accordingly, applicants contend that claims 12 and 19 are also allowable over the cited art for the reasons set forth above and respectfully request that the rejection of these claims be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20 include all of the features of one of independent claims 1, 12, and 19 from which they ultimately depend. Thus, claims 2, 4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20 are also allowable over the cited art for at least the reasons set forth with respect to independent claims 1, 12, and 19. Accordingly, applicants contend that claims 2, 4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20 are likewise allowable and, therefore, respectfully request that the rejection of claims 2, 4, 6-11, 13-18, and 20 be withdrawn.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Boulay in view of U.S. Statutory Invention Registration H526 to Miller (herein Miller). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration. Claim 3 depends directly from claim 1 and includes all of the features and limitations of claim 1. The feature that was found to be lacking in Boulay with reference to claim 1 is not found in Miller; namely, a shield including a cover portion and a plurality of extension adjacent the cover portion where the extensions define a channel that slidably engages an enclosure to inhibit EMI emissions from the enclosure. Thus, Miller fails to make up for the deficiencies of Boulay. Accordingly, applicants contend that claim 3 is allowable and, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3.

Appn. No.: 10/727,757
Amendment Dated: July 18, 2005
Reply to Office Action of April 18, 2005

TN324 (UNS-457US)

In view of the claim amendments and remarks set forth above, applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-4 and 6-23 are in condition for allowance and early notification to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

RatnerPrestia


Joshua L. Cohen, Reg. No. 38,040
Stephen J. Weed, Reg. No. 45,202
Attorneys for Applicants

SJW/kpc


Dated: July 18, 2005

P. O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

The Commissioner for Patents is hereby authorized to charge payment to Deposit Account No. **18-0350** of any fees associated with this communication.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail, with sufficient postage, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on:

July 18/2005


Kathleen P. Carney